REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview on July 27, 2006.

In the last Office Action, mailed June 26, 2006, claims 1-11, 15-19, 24 and 26-29 were considered and rejected. Claims 1, 6-11, 17-19, 24 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strentzsch et al. (US 6,256,671) hereinafter *Strentzsch*. Claims 2-5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Strentzsch* in view of Aziz et al. (US 6,119,234) hereinafter *Aziz*. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Strentzsch* in view of Onweller (US 5,799,016) hereinafter *Onweller*.[1] By this paper claims 1, 24, and 26 have been amended, claim 29 has been cancelled, and new claims 30 and 31 have been added.

It will be noted that the amendments to the specification and claims explicitly incorporate material from the provisional application Serial Number 60/327,107 filed on October 4, 2001 entitled "Transparent Replacement of Native Host Name Resolver" illustrated on page 1 paragraph 7 and page 2 paragraph 1 of the provisional application. Priority was claimed to this provisional application in the utility filing, and the provisional application was incorporated by reference at that time. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the specification and claims do not add any new matter.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, the invention is generally directed to facilitating domain name resolution for computer devices whose native host name data protocol is not compatible with host name data resolution protocols across a particular connection on a network. A requesting computer system may include a native host name resolver that is not capable of resolving a host name when the requesting computer system is connected to the network. The native host name resolver may be unable to resolve host names due to advances in name resolution techniques or proprietary name resolution techniques that have advanced past the capabilities of the native host name resolver. Thus, resolving a host name may be accomplished by using a non-native replacement resolver on the computer system which is capable of resolving host names on the network. The replacement resolver receives name

[1] Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

resolution requests from the native resolver so as to extend the functionality of the computer system. This may extend the useful life of the computer system by allowing the computer system to be used on networks that it was not originally intended to be used with.

Each of the claims as amended recites that "the requesting computer system is a single physical device docked to a resolving computer system." The limitation that the computer system is a single physical device prevents the application of *Strentzch* as anticipating the claims of the present application for showing "an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system."

In direct contrast to what is recited by the claims of the present application, the cited sections of *Strentzch* do not show the DNS proxy 260 being assigned as a resolver for itself, but rather only show that the DNS proxy 260 is assigned as a resolver for clients 210, 220, and 230. See Col. 5, lines 54-56 which state that "[t]he DNS proxy 260 manages DNS queries from Internet browsers executing on client systems 210, 220 and 230." However, no disclosure is made in *Strentzch* disclosing that the DNS proxy 260 is assigned as the name server for the DNS proxy itself or the gateway 250. However, the claims of the present application recite that the requesting computer system is assigned as its own name server. *Strentzsch* only discloses the DNS proxy 260 sending out DNS queries over the Internet to other DNS name servers, not to itself (See e.g. Col. 6, lines 40-41 and Col. 5, lines 42-46). Notably, the independent claims of the application have been amended to recite that the requesting computer system is a single physical device, which eliminates interpreting *Strentzsch* such that the client systems 210, 220 and 230 along with the DNS proxy 260 or gateway 250 read on the computer system. The Examiner seemed to agree with this reasoning during the telephonic interview.

As noted above, each of the independent claims specifically recites "assigning the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system...." While the gateway 250 illustrated in *Strentzsch* does include a reduced feature DNS name server in the DNS proxy 260, that DNS proxy 260 is not assigned as the name server for the gateway 250 as would be required to read on the claims of the present application. Rather, the gateway 250 is assigned as a DNS server for the clients 210, 220 and 230. While the gateway 250 can resolve host name data sent to the gateway, it does it by looking up IP addresses from the host name data using a standard cache, as not as the assigned name server for the gateway. See col. 5, line 62-col. 6, line 10. The Examiner seemed to concur with this line of reasoning.

Each of the independent claims 1, 24 and 26 of the present application further recite "the requesting computer system is a single physical device docked to a resolving computer system." None of the art cited by the Examiner (*Strentzsch, Aziz or Onweller*) shows a docking arrangement where the requesting computer system is docked to a resolving computer system.

While not necessary, Applicants would further like to point out the new dependent claim 31. Claim 31 recites that "the resolving computer system forwards the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system to a name server, and wherein receiving a resolved address at the native host name resolver of the requesting computer system corresponding to the host name data comprises receiving the resolved address directly from the name server bypassing the resolving computer system." This is illustrated in Figure 2 of the present application by arrow 3, arrow 4, and arrow 6' (as distinguished from arrow 6) and described in detail at paragraph [0046]. In direct contrast, *Strentzsch* shows only communication from both directions being routed through the gateway 250 and does not illustrate the gateway being bypassed for DNS responses. Similarly, *Aziz* shows all queries and responses being routed to the local NS 250 without the local NS 250 being bypassed for the responses.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicants acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicants reserve the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 28th day of August, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:JLO:crb:ahy
AHY0000001151V001